arXiv:hep-th/9211080v1 18 Nov 1992

UT-Komaba/92-11
November 1992

Equivalence of BRST cohomologies for 2-d black hole and $c = 1$ Liouville theory

Hiroshi Ishikawa [1] and Mitsuhiro Kato [2]

Institute of Physics, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Tokyo, Komaba
Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153, Japan

ABSTRACT

We study the relation between the $SL(2,R)/U(1)$ black hole and the $c = 1$ Liouville theory. A deformation, which interpolates the BRST operators of both models, is explicitly constructed. This interpolation is isomorphic, and the physical spectrum of the black hole is equivalent to that of the $c = 1$ model tensored by a topological $U(1)/U(1)$ model. Some implications of the deformation are discussed.

[1]E-mail address: hishikawa@tkyvax.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp
[2]E-mail address: katom@tkyvax.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

1 Introduction

Although string theory has many plausible properties, it also has several difficulties which prevent us to analyze it in detail. One of them is that we have no satisfactory formulation independent of the background fields in which strings propagate. We have to specify the backgrounds before we construct a model to examine. The other is that there are no principle to single out one specific vacuum from numerous candidates for a realistic model which reproduces our real world in the low energy limit. Towards the resolution of these problems, we have to construct various kinds of models which have distinct backgrounds and to understand their mutual relations. But, this program is difficult to carry out, especially, in the case of higher dimensional target space. Higher dimension requires more degrees of freedom, which make the analysis too complicated to handle.

Two-dimensional string theory, which is a theory with a two-dimensional target space, is appropriate for this aim, since it needs only two degrees of freedom in order to describe a target space. This model is a toy model from the point of view of the unified string theory; our real world has, at least, four dimensions. However, it has many features peculiar to string theory, and the study of it would give us deep insight to the nature of string theory, specifically a clue to a background independent formulation. For this goal, it is necessary to have several models and to uncover their relations.

In the case of two-dimensions, their are two models examined in detail; $c = 1$ Liouville theory and $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ black hole proposed by Witten [1]. Although many authors are discussing their relations or correspondence with each other, it seems that their is no satisfactory argument yet [2, 3, 4, 5].

In this paper, we construct a one-parameter family of the BRST operator which interpolates between the $c = 1$ model and the black hole. Since this interpolation is isomorphic, we can extract the physical spectrum of the black hole from that of the $c = 1$ model. Strictly speaking, what corresponds to the black hole is not the $c = 1$ model but the $c = 1$ model tensored by a topological degree of freedom. Hence, the spectrum of the black hole is essentially that of the $c = 1$, which exhibits a close connection between these two.

In the next section, we prepare the $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ black hole in the bosonized form, which is the starting point of our analysis. In Section 3, the interpolation of the BRST operator, which can be considered as a deformation of the black hole to the $c = 1$ model, is explicitly constructed. The spectrum of the black hole is obtained by means of this interpolation in

Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to some discussions and comments.

2 $SL(2,R)/U(1)$ black hole

The $SL(2,R)/U(1)$ black hole is a model which has the $SL(2,R)/U(1)$ manifold as a target space. We describe this space using the $SL(2,R)$ current algebra

$$J_3(z)\,J_3(w) \sim \frac{-k/2}{(z-w)^2}\ , \tag{1}$$

$$J_3(z)\,J^{\pm}(w) \sim \frac{\pm 1}{z-w}\,J^{\pm}(w)\ , \tag{2}$$

$$J^{+}(z)\,J^{-}(w) \sim \frac{k}{(z-w)^2} - \frac{2}{z-w}\,J_3(w)\ . \tag{3}$$

k is the level of this algebra.

This can be bosonized as follows;

$$J_3 = \sqrt{\frac{k}{2}}\,\partial u\ , \tag{4}$$

$$J^{\pm} = i\left(\sqrt{\frac{k'}{2}}\,\partial\phi \pm i\sqrt{\frac{k}{2}}\,\partial X\right)\exp\left(\pm i\sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}(X+i\,u)\right)\ , \tag{5}$$

where ϕ, X and u are free bosons with positive signature satisfying, *e.g.*, $\phi(z)\phi(w) \sim -\log(z-w)$, and $k' = k-2$. In this realization of the algebra, the energy-momentum tensor by means of the Sugawara construction reads

$$\begin{aligned} T_{SL(2,R)} &= \frac{1}{k-2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(J^+J^- + J^-J^+\right) - J_3J_3\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k'}}\partial^2\phi - \frac{1}{2}(\partial X)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial u)^2\ . \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The primary field $V_{j,m}$ which creates the state with spin j and $J_3 = m$ is realized as

$$V_{j,m}(z) = \exp\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{k'}}\,j\,\phi(z)\right)\exp\left(i\sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}\,m(X(z)+i\,u(z))\right)\ . \tag{7}$$

In order to obtain the quotient space $SL(2,R)/U(1)$, we gauge away a $U(1)$ degree of freedom generated by J_3. This gauging is performed by a BRST operator [6]. Since J_3 has a Schwinger term in the operator product expansion (OPE) with itself, we introduce a gauge boson v, satisfying $v(z)v(w) \sim -\log(z-w)$, to absorb this singularity. Then the BRST operator for the $U(1)$ gauge fixing takes the following form

$$Q_{U(1)} = \oint\frac{dz}{2\pi i}\,\xi(J_3 - i\sqrt{\frac{k}{2}}\,\partial v) = \oint\frac{dz}{2\pi i}\,\xi\sqrt{\frac{k}{2}}(\partial u - i\,\partial v)\ . \tag{8}$$

Here ξ, and its pair η, are fermionic ghosts with dimension $h = 0$ and 1, and obey $\xi(z)\eta(w) \sim 1/(z-w)$. This BRST operator is nilpotent

$$Q_{U(1)}^2 = 0 \ . \tag{9}$$

Gauge fixing is now carried out by taking the BRST cohomology as usual. Since we introduced some new fields in this process, the total energy-momentum tensor has additional contributions

$$T_{SL(2,R)/U(1)} = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k'}}\partial^2\phi - \frac{1}{2}(\partial X)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial u)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial v)^2 - \eta\,\partial\xi \ . \tag{10}$$

The central charge of this system reads

$$c_{SL(2,R)/U(1)} = 2 + \frac{6}{k-2} \ . \tag{11}$$

The $SL(2,R)$ primary fields (7) now turn into unphysical ones, and we need to dress them properly in order to obtain the physical operators. The dressed or $SL(2,R)/U(1)$ primary fields $\tilde{V}_{j,m}$ now can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{j,m}(z) &= V_{j,m}(z)\,\exp\left(i\sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}m\,v(z)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{k'}}j\,\phi(z)\right)\,\exp\left(i\sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}m(X(z)+i\,u(z)+v(z))\right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

It should be noted that zero modes of X, u and v appear only in the combination of $X + i\,(u - i\,v)$. This fact enables us to consider the Fock space of this model as consisting of the states with momentum in this combination. We denote this space as $\mathcal{F}_{SL(2,R)/U(1)}$.

Next, we couple this system to the world sheet gravity to construct a string theory. Gauge fixing of the diffeomorphism invariance requires $c_{SL(2,R)/U(1)} = 26$, which means $k = 9/4$. We restrict ourselves to this critical case. The BRST operator for the diffeomorphism invariance is then defined as

$$Q_{diff} = \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i}\,(c\,T_{SL(2,R)/U(1)} + bc\,\partial c), \tag{13}$$

where b and c are the diffeomorphism ghosts with $b(z)\,c(w) \sim 1/(z-w)$. We define the total BRST operator as

$$Q_{BH} = Q_{diff} + Q_{U(1)} \ . \tag{14}$$

Since Q_{diff} is nilpotent and anti-commutes with $Q_{U(1)}$, our BRST operator is nilpotent

$$Q_{BH}^2 = 0 \ . \tag{15}$$

The Fock space of this model is now constructed by tensoring that of b and c with $\mathcal{F}_{SL(2,R)/U(1)}$. We define the physical states of the black hole as the Q_{BH} cohomology in this Fock space.

3 Deformation of the model

Physical degrees of freedom in string theory are governed by the BRST operator. From this point of view, deforming a string theory is equivalent to deforming a BRST operator keeping its nilpotency. We apply this idea to the case of the black hole.

Let us consider the following deformation

$$Q(\alpha) = e^{\alpha R}\, Q_{BH}\, e^{-\alpha R} \tag{16}$$

for a certain operator R with dimension 0 and the ghost number 0. Note that this causes an automorphism in the operator algebra and that $Q(\alpha)$ is necessarily nilpotent for an arbitrary α. This operation is, therefore, a deformation of the model in the sense above. Our choice of the operator R is

$$R = \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i}\, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} c\, \eta(\partial u + i\, \partial v) \quad . \tag{17}$$

The explicit form of $Q(\alpha)$ then reads

$$Q(\alpha) = \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \left(c\, \tilde{T}(\alpha) + bc\, \partial c \right) + Q_{U(1)} \quad , \tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}(\alpha) \;\; &= \;\; -\frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \sqrt{2}\partial^2\phi - \frac{1}{2}(\partial X)^2 \\ &\quad + (1-\alpha)\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\partial u)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial v)^2 - \eta\, \partial\xi + \alpha \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \partial c\, \eta(\partial u + i\, \partial v) \right) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Note that $\tilde{T}(\alpha) \neq e^{\alpha R} T_{SL(2,R)/U(1)}\, e^{-\alpha R}$ and does not satisfy the Virasoro algebra in general.

The situation becomes very simple if we set $\alpha = 1$. $\tilde{T}(\alpha)$ then contains the first three terms only which are nothing but the energy-momentum tensor of the $c = 1$ model. The BRST operator takes the form

$$Q(1) = Q_{c=1} + Q_{U(1)} \quad , \tag{20}$$

where

$$Q_{c=1} \;\; = \;\; \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \left(c\, T_{c=1} + bc\, \partial c \right) \quad , \tag{21}$$

$$T_{c=1} \;\; = \;\; -\frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \sqrt{2}\, \partial^2\phi - \frac{1}{2}(\partial X)^2 \quad . \tag{22}$$

$Q(1)$ splits into two anti-commuting pieces; one operates on the $c = 1$ sector and the other does on the rest which spanned by u, v, ξ and η. In other words, we have, at $\alpha = 1$, a system of the $c = 1$ model tensored by additional degrees of freedom, which completely decouple from the $c = 1$ sector. This $U(1)$ sector is a topological one, a coset model $U(1)/U(1)$, and can be considered to have no physical significance. In fact, this sector, together with $Q_{U(1)}$ as a BRST operator, realizes a twisted $N = 2$ super conformal algebra, which is a well-known example for the topological conformal field theory. Hence, our system at $\alpha = 1$ is essentially the $c = 1$ model, and the deformation generated by R can be regarded as an interpolation between the $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ black hole and the $c = 1$ model, which reveals a close connection between these two.

4 Physical spectrum of the black hole

In this section, we study the physical spectrum of the $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ black hole making use of the interpolation obtained above.

The physical states are defined as the BRST cohomology. Since the deformation (16) causes an automorphism in the operator algebra, we need a cohomology for only one value of α; the results for the other values follow immediately. Specifically, from a physical operator $V_0(z)$ of the black hole ($\alpha = 0$), we can construct that of the other value of α

$$V_\alpha(z) = e^{\alpha R} V_0(z) e^{-\alpha R} \quad . \tag{23}$$

This process can be reversed and allows us to determine the physical spectrum of the black hole from that of the $c = 1$ model.

The model at $\alpha = 1$ is, however, not the $c = 1$ model but the $c = 1$ model tensored by the $U(1)$ sector. Therefore, we need at first to solve the cohomology of this system. Note that we have a completely decoupling system, which means that $Q_{c=1}$ and $Q_{U(1)}$ operate on its own sector respectively and behave as a unit operator on another sector. Hence, the cohomology $H^*_{Q(1)}$ of $Q(1)$ is nothing but the tensor product of $Q_{c=1}$ and $Q_{U(1)}$

$$H^*_{Q(1)} = H^*_{c=1} \bigotimes H^*_{U(1)} \quad , \tag{24}$$

which follows from the famous Künneth formula [7]. Thus, what we need is only to determine $H^*_{c=1}$ and $H^*_{U(1)}$ separately.

The cohomology $H^*_{c=1}$ of the $c=1$ system is known [8]. We shall show in Appendix that $H^*_{U(1)}$ consists of two kinds of elements,

$$H^*_{U(1)} = \{e^{k(u-i\,v)}\} \bigoplus \{\xi\, e^{k(u-i\,v)}\} \quad . \tag{25}$$

In Section 2, however, we defined our Fock space as containing the zero modes of u and v in the combination of $X + i\,(u - i\,v)$. Hence, the momentum k in (25) is fixed if we specify the momentum of X. This means that $H^*_{U(1)}$ is essentially two-dimensional upon tensoring with $H^*_{c=1}$, and the cohomology of $Q(1)$ is merely two copies of $H^*_{c=1}$. As we mentioned above, the cohomology H^*_{BH} of the black hole is isomorphic to that of $Q(1)$. Hence, our computation of $H_{Q(1)}$ leads us to the following remarkable result;

$$H^*_{BH} \simeq H^*_{c=1} \bigoplus \xi_0\, H^*_{c=1} \quad . \tag{26}$$

The physical spectrum of the $SL(2,R)/U(1)$ black hole coincides with that of the $c=1$ model except the zero mode of the ghost.

By means of the different method from the present one, Distler and Nelson [4] calculated the BRST cohomology of the black hole to find out the extra states besides the $c=1$ ones. On comparing these two models, they adopted the following correspondence between the label j, m of the $SL(2,R)$ states and the $c=1$ momentum p_ϕ, p_X;

$$p_\phi = \sqrt{8}\, j \quad , \quad p_X = \frac{\sqrt{8}}{3}\, m \quad . \tag{27}$$

Let us examine this correspondence from our point of view.

In the $c=1$ model, the field with momentum, p_ϕ, p_X, reads

$$\exp\left(p_\phi \phi + i\, p_X X\right) \quad . \tag{28}$$

The black hole counterpart of this field can be obtained making use of our automorphism (23). Because this does not alter ϕ and X, the $c=1$ field (28) is mapped into itself. Comparing this expression (28) with the form (7) of the $SL(2,R)$ primary field, we can conclude that the field with the $c=1$ momentum p_ϕ, p_X, is turned into the field with the $SL(2,R)$ label j, m, which are related by the formula (27) adopted by Distler and Nelson. Since the momenta of the physical states in our model at $\alpha = 1$ are exactly the same as the $c=1$ model, the spectrum of the black hole completely coincides with that of the $c=1$ model; there are no extra states in our formulation of the model.

5 Discussion

In the previous sections, we demonstrated that the $c = 1$ model can be constructed out of the $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ black hole using an appropriate automorphism of the operator algebra.

A possible interpretation of the transformation is a deformation of the target space imbedded in a higher dimensional space. The following facts support this observation.

First, the starting point of our analysis, the $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ black hole, needs three dimensions in describing its target space, which is a coset space $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ and can be considered as a two-dimensional surface imbedded in a three-dimensional space. The BRST operator $Q_{U(1)}$ for the $U(1)$ gauge fixing restricts string propagation to this two-dimensional surface. Second, our model at $\alpha = 1$ is not the $c = 1$ model itself but the $c = 1$ model tensored by a topological degree of freedom which can be regarded as a $U(1)/U(1)$ model. It is, therefore, possible to look upon the $\alpha = 1$ model as a sort of coset model, $c = 1 \bigotimes U(1)/U(1)$. The BRST operator $Q_{c=1}$ for diffeomorphism does not contain this $U(1)$ direction, which suggests that the third or $U(1)$ coordinate completely decouples from the target space, *i.e.,* the target space of this model is a two-dimensional plane in a three-dimensional space, which is perpendicular to the $U(1)$ direction. The BRST operator $Q_{U(1)}$ again serves as a constraint for the target space. Finally, it should be noted that we fixed the Fock space of the model in deforming the black hole by the operator R. In other words, it was an automorphism of the operator algebra that we made use of. This seems to imply that a three-dimensional space, in which the two-dimensional target space is imbedded, is fixed in our deformation of the model, while the target space, a two-dimensional surface, is deformed within this three-dimensional space. In order to make this picture more concrete one, it would be necessary to examine our model from more geometrical points of view, for example, the sigma model approach.

As was pointed out in the last section, the physical spectrum of the black hole in our formulation is different from that of Distler and Nelson. If our BRST operator Q_{BH} (14) annihilates their extra states, they are necessarily Q_{BH}-exact ones because their momenta are off the $c = 1$ grid where the BRST cohomology is trivial. It should be worth figuring out the meaning of their analysis.

In a recent paper, Eguchi, Kanno and Yang [5] also argued the equivalence of the $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ black hole to the $c = 1$ model. They showed that the energy-momentum tensor of the black hole can be rewritten as that of the $c = 1$ up to BRST exact terms under

a suitable substitution of the fields, and concluded that the physical spectrum of the black hole is identical to that of the $c = 1$. It is, however, not the energy-momentum tensor but the BRST operator that determines the spectrum of the model in full. We should discuss the correspondence of the BRST operators rather than the energy-momentum tensors. In [5], they adopted a bosonized form of the $SL(2, R)$ current algebra different from the present one (5). Their transformation of ϕ and X and that of b play slightly different roles. The former is a part of the "rotation" that brings the background charge of four bosons together to one particular boson ϕ, and is only needed for their form of the bosonization. The latter is, on the other hand, relevant for (but gives only a part of) our transformation generated by the R (17).[1]

Lastly, we comment that the transformation of the BRST charge of the $SL(2, R)/U(1)$ gauged WZW-model to that of the $c = 1$ Liouville theory can be generalized to other models. Namely, for the general G/H gauged WZW-model coupled to 2-d gravity, we have a BRST charge in the form of $Q = Q_{diff} + Q_H$, where Q_H is a BRST charge for gauging a subgroup H of G and Q_{diff} is that for local diffeomorphism. Then we can construct the analogue of R in eq.(17) which transforms Q into the direct sum $Q_{G/H} + Q_H$, where $Q_{G/H}$ is the BRST charge of the GKO [9] type coset theory coupled to 2-d gravity and Q_H is that of the H/H topological theory. An emphasis is again on the fact that the $Q_{G/H}$ and Q_H are completely decoupled. Details will be reported elsewhere.

Acknowledgements

The work of M.K. is supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists (# 04740139) and by that for Scientific Research on Priority Areas "Infinite Analysis" (# 04245208) from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

[1] Note that their fields ϕ', X' and b' are not orthogonal to the field β.

Appendix Cohomology of $Q_{U(1)}$

We determine the cohomology of $Q_{U(1)}$,

$$Q_{U(1)} = \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i}\, \xi\, \frac{3}{\sqrt{8}}(\partial u - i\,\partial v) \ . \tag{A.1}$$

First, we define P^- as

$$P^- = \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i}\, (\partial u - i\,\partial v) \ . \tag{A.2}$$

Note that the cohomology is trivial unless P^- vanishes, because P^- can be written as a BRST commutator

$$P^- \propto \{Q_{U(1)}, \eta_0\} \ . \tag{A.3}$$

One can show that the level counting operator N, which counts the oscillator level of the states, also can be written as a BRST exact one;

$$N = \{Q_{U(1)}, K\} \ \text{, where } \ K = \frac{3\,i}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{n\neq 0} \eta_{-n}(u_n + i\,v_n) \ . \tag{A.4}$$

Therefore, the cohomology appears only in the level 0 sector. Since the zero mode of ξ does not vanish on the $SL(2,C)$ vacuum, the cohomology of $Q_{U(1)}$ is spanned by two kinds of elements

$$H^*_{U(1)} = \{e^{k(u-i\,v)}\} \bigoplus \{\xi\, e^{k(u-i\,v)}\} \ , \tag{A.5}$$

where k runs all the value of the momenta.

References

[1] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 314.

[2] M. Bershadsky and D. Kutasov, Phys. Lett. **B266** (1991) 345.

[3] E. Martinec and S. Shatashvili, Nucl. Phys. **B368** (1992) 338.

[4] J. Distler and P. Nelson, Nucl. Phys. **B374** (1992) 123.

[5] T. Eguchi, H. Kanno and S.-K. Yang, W_∞ Algebra in two-dimensional black hole, Newton Institute Preprint NI92004.

[6] See, for example, D. Karabali and H. Schnitzer, Nucl. Phys. **B329** (1990) 649.

[7] See, for example, R. Bott and L. Tu, *Differential forms in algebraic topology*, Springer.

[8] B. Lian and G. Zuckerman, Phys. Lett. **B266** (1991) 21.

[9] P. Goddard, A. Kent and D. Olive, Phys. Lett. **B152** (1985) 88.